Spring 4-20-1976

The Rhetorical Effect of an 18th Century British Tractate on the American War of Independence

William A. Hansen
Seattle Pacific University

The 1976 Winifred E. Weter Faculty Lecture

SEATTLE PACIFIC COLLEGE

Seattle Pacific University
" Winifred E. Meter faculty award lecture

The 1976 Faculty Lecture

Seattle Pacific College

THE RHETORICAL EFFECT OF AN 18TH CENTURY BRITISH TRACTATE ON THE AMERICAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

William A. Hansen, Ph.D.

Professor of Speech

April 20, 1976

THE RHETORICAL EFFECT OF AN 18TH CENTURY BRITISH TRACTATE ON THE AMERICAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

A view of the life and work of John Wesley, 1702-1791, constitutes an exciting venture into the religious, political, economic and social history of eighteenth-century England. Wesley is recognized by historians as the most important religious leader of that century. Correspondingly, along with George Whitefield and perhaps one or two others, he enjoys the highest reputation for the preaching of God's message in that century.[1]

Wesley has also inspired the research efforts of such diverse scholars as literary critics, linguists, sociologists and physicians, as well as homileticians and students of public address. This "great and complex character, one of the greatest known to modern times,"[2] is best seen for the purpose of this study through such biographers as Luke Tyerman and Father Piette,[3] who demonstrate both the depth and latitude of Wesley's public concerns.

According to these historians, Wesley stood neither apart nor aloof from the problems of his fellow men. He apprehended the needs of the poor and oppressed, he rebelled at the gulf between poverty and luxury, he exhibited concern for social order and for loyalty to country and crown. He sought directly to influence public opinion. "In an age of pamphleteers," it has been said, "he was a prolific writer of these instruments of politics and social righteousness, a voluminous letterwriter to the press."[4] He was a controversialist eagerly and continually exhibiting his attitude toward successive events in the political sphere, for example, from the '45 Rebellion and in the case of John Wilkes, to the American War of Independence and the Abolition of the Slave Trade.

This study is designed to discover the influence of Wesley's pamphlet rhetoric on the American War of Independence. To this end, a view of Wesley's preparation for rhetorical activity, his adjustment to varied audiences and his involvement in wide-ranging public issues through the medium of public disputation will be useful. A more careful scrutiny of the sources of his political ideas and of those tractates he wrote and published on the subject of the war will reveal the strength of his arguments.

I

JOHN WESLEY'S RHETORICAL TRAINING

Truth has a tendency to prevail over error, as Aristotle observed in his treatise on rhetoric, but truth in competition with error, wherein skillful men have an interest in making error prevail, needs the help of as attractive and revealing a setting as possible. John Wesley, as a "good man speaking well," vividly demonstrated a body of rhetorical principles in his defense of truth to eighteenth-century audiences.

Throughout a lifetime of pamphlet controversy over ecclesiastical and secular affairs, the founder of Methodism influenced public opinion and private judgment. Moreover, his influence prevailed, at least among his lay assistants, as a model to be emulated in the art of disputation. In the course of time his enemies became silent out of respect for, if not fear of, his voice and pen. What were the sources of Wesley's argumentative power?

During an extended defense of Methodist practices, Wesley was accused of being a master at the arts of subtlety and disguise, and expert in argumentative shifting. He called the charge, "mere commonplace, with which a man fond of such flowers may embellish his page on any occasion." But he proceeded to inform his antagonist of his qualifications:

> For many years I was Moderator in the disputations, which were held each week at Lincoln College, in Oxford. I could not avoid acquiring hereby some degree of expertness in arguing; and especially in discerning and pointing out well-covered and plausible fallacies. I have since found abundant reason to praise God for giving me this honest art. By this, when men have hedged me in by what they called demonstrations, I have been many times able to dash them in pieces; in spite of all its covers, to touch the very point where the fallacy lay; and it flew open in a moment.[5]

By his "honest art," Wesley took the propositions of his opponents and untwisted truth and falsehood so that all unprejudiced men could see the impossibility of piecing them together again.[6] His numerous pamphlets doubtless reminded his readers constantly that he was still a fellow of Lincoln College, so frequent are the tags of his Oxford education.[7]

In Wesley's pamphlet controversy, he uniformly demonstrated a wide comprehension of the issues at hand, a character above question and a tenderness of spirit which enhanced his personal proof among his bitterest opponents and with the populace at large. His use of the syllogism, his naming of fallacies, particularly of begging the question, a weakness most prevalent in the arguments posed against his doctrine and practice, are amply buttressed by thorough knowledge of the principles of logic.

To Wesley, however, logical proof meant more than a proper use of deductive and inductive reasoning and of accurate evidence. He also included the development of ideas in variety and depth. Sheridan's Lectures on Elocution and Blair's Sermons he found lacking in depth of logical structure. "There is more matter in my penny tract on Action and Utterance," he observed, "than all Mr. Sheridan's book."[8] And, although he admired Blair's elegance, he reminded his readers that the minister of St. Giles was "not a deep writer."[9] Nor was Wesley less sparing of John Locke's Essay on Human Understanding. He expressed dismay over Locke's "total ignorance of logic" and advised young students to read the treatise "with a judicious tutor, who could confirm and enlarge upon what is right, and guard them against what is wrong, in it," and avoid "that immoderate attachment to him which is so common among his readers."[10]

Wesley's use of classical rhetorical patterns is most evident in his confrontation with various antagonists during the eighteenth century through the medium of the pamphlet. With the exception of memory and delivery, which he emphasizes in his writings for the sake of his preachers, all of the canons may be discerned in his published works. His formal training developed his logical power, enabling him to see clearly, and to controvert effectively, wherein the arguments of his opponents became fallacious or thin.

Moreover, his sense of order and structure produced a method in controversy difficult to overturn. Therefore his strategies were seldom questioned, except as material in argumentum ad hominem attacks. Nor could the sources of his information endure successful attack. His wide reading and extensive traveling furnished his inquisitive mind with useful data on a multitude of subjects; and with singular power he continually amazed his fellows with a depth of understanding and an enviable probity in matters of concern in public affairs.

II

WESLEY'S AUDIENCES

Alfred North Whitehead in his Adventure of Ideas observes that although "the final introduction of a reform does not necessarily prove the moral superiority of the reforming generation," it does "require that that generation exhibits reforming energy." Whitehead rejects as a naive view of the history of ideas that any great idea, such as the abolition of slavery, is merely waiting for a good man, strong enough to carry it into practical effect. Rather, the ideal is present, perhaps in the loftiest reflections of men of any age, actively promoting conditions adequate to bear the burden of its consummation.[11] A consideration of Wesley's audiences in the context of the times reveals conditions conducive to reform, if not the necessary reforming energy.

For England's supremacy, and empire, and the comfortable wealth it gave to the relatively few of the privileged classes, a high price in privation was paid by the many rated low on the economic and social scale. As the century progressed, these unattached and neutral members of society were "disciplined into a compact, nationwide community, focussed into self-consciousness and made a positive force"[12] in the nation. The intellectual, religious, political and social conditions that so profoundly affected the citizen of eighteenth-century England were of concern to Wesley.

The educated eighteenth-century mind was inclined toward reason and common sense and away from emotion and enthusiasm. Even the theological concepts and doctrines were subject to empirical examination. Skepticism emerged to replace blind faith based upon revered authority. Locke's Essay on Human Understanding and the Reasonableness of Christianity were largely responsible for the extension of skepticism even into religious circles. Deism and deistic rationalism fostered a "naturalism"[13] in public philosophy that perforce contributed to the practical materialism and, in a context of reason, encouraged a measure of self-complacency on the part of all classes of society.

The eighteenth century may be called the century of the reasonable man. Inasmuch as Sir Isaac Newton had brought the physical universe from chaos to order, why should not religion too be enveloped in a few grand generalizations as universal as the law of gravitation? To the reasonable man evil was a necessary limitation rather than a flaw. If he was not so high as the angels in the "chain of being" he was yet far above the worm. To recognize his alloted place in the universe was the beginning of wisdom for the reasonable man. His rational hope was to look for steady improvement in the world, if men would only listen to the dictates of good sense and moderation.

Furthermore, the reasonable man joined Locke in abandoning the Platonic doctrine of innate ideas in favor of the doctrine of experience, which led to a belief that in the conditions of society the roots of good and evil could be found. A better society would make better men. A rational readjustment of social institutions could make men virtually perfect in the distant future. This doctrine of perfectibility of mankind, in vogue during the century, underlaid nearly all eighteenth century thinking, whether conservative or radical.

The message of the church during the eighteenth century was strongly tempered by the prevailing intellectual trend toward naturalism and reason. Hence, the preachers sought to prove the purely rational character of religion, and, influenced by the skeptics within their own ranks who asserted the sufficiency of natural religion, went on to establish that Christianity is no more than natural religion substantiated by historical proof. Their lack of success was certainly intensified by their low estate, by non-residence,[14] and by the attendant neglect of parish duties.

Since religious indifference pervaded England, producing further neglect of duty among the clergy and greater moral laxity among laymen, the churches actually in existence were empty; and a clergy devoid of conscientiousness or zeal had an interest in maintaining empty pews. Their work was easier. But even if the pews had been filled, they would certainly have been insufficient to hold even a small minority of the population of England. But perhaps the most severe judgment on the English church of the eighteenth century is on its lack of concern for the increasing needs of the lower classes in the face of changing social conditions.

All this insistence on calm reasonableness might indicate that the political life at the beginning of the century was calm. But it was not.[15] This era was the golden age of the pamphleteers and the writers of newsletters. Freed from the restrictions of a licensed press, writers hired themselves out to political factions and, in the long run, vastly increased the power of popular opinion.

Mass agitation for political ends was in evidence from the beginning of the century. The Sacheverell case, the outcry against Walpole's excise schemes and the insistence on the Spanish war, the Jewish exclusion outcry in 1753, and the Gordon Riots all indicated a readiness to claim democratic control. So easily was mob violence incited that leaders with sufficient self interest could bend it at will, often in direct opposition to the best interests of the masses themselves. Ultimately the process helped make the disenfranchised politically conscious and responsible, as popular demand became deliberate, such as in the platform agitation against the cider tax in 1763. But the century opened and closed with the prevailing political conviction that the individual was incompetent to exercise self-government, and that any claim to a political voice on any other than a basis of property was unthinkable.

The general state of society in this period is characterized vividly by the great cleavage between the "well-to-do 'persons of fashion and fortune' and the poor or 'lower order of the people.'"[16] With the increased prosperity that resulted from the Treaty of Utrecht, wealth rather than blood or service separated the important class from the destitute, or even from the wage-earning poor.[17]

The lot of the poor was hard. Even those with some skill and ambition found difficulty in making ends meet, and the scarcity of work drove many to drink or crime. Those lesser endowed suffered through an ill-administered system of poor relief. Their suffering was intensified by prevailing attitudes concerning the causes of poverty--laziness and lack of discipline. A belief in existence of a poor class as an economic necessity and as a justification of a permanent partition of society prevailed.

Between the poor and the rich lay "the Middling Sort."[18] The middle class was not homogeneous, since a wide range of incomes and a great difference in life styles prevailed among them. At the lowest level, bridging the gap between those casual workers in abject poverty and the shopkeepers and small merchants, were the artisans and journeymen. They worked long hours for wages that barely kept them above the subsistence level. They were at the mercy of trade and commerce, and trade fluctuated. They attempted to combine for power and wages, but were restrained from doing so. There were many in this group who were literate and politically aware, and the "violent . . . attacks on the government in The Craftsman or Fogg's Weekly--the rabid Jacobite paper--first stimulated, and then focused their sense of grievance with life. But again, cheap food and good years of trade assuaged their animosity and kept it in bounds."[19]

The aristocracy and gentry enjoyed full social prestige and political rights. Although heavily outnumbered by those who made a living by manufacture or trade the gentry owned the land that alone gave them exclusive rights. As a class they were often selfish, self indulgent and immoral, but it must be said that they lifted the standards of good taste in the arts and exemplified a high public spirit and devotion to public duty.

Throughout his ministry Wesley taught that better men would make a better society, and perfectibility became the responsibility of the individual working out his personal salvation. Moreover, he taught that religion, in addition to being rational, should also be a thing of experience. Methodism existed only for the purpose of enlivening the Church to a concern for the spiritual and social needs of citizens at all levels of society.

Almost from the beginning, and increasingly during the century, John Wesley made an appeal to the middle, professional and upper classes, while large numbers of Methodists moved up in social status through their own efforts.[20] But he continually stressed his movement's ministry to the lower economic classes. Hence at all times they constituted the bulk of his following. Not only were his followers therefore representative of all classes of a society subject to the varied influences of the times, but also they were products of conditioning through his organizational structure.

The Methodist Audience

At the first annual conference of the United Societies in June, 1744, John Wesley described his organizational groups as follows: the United Societies, the Bands, the Select Societies, and a "body of penitents" who had made "shipwreck of their faith."[21] Four years later, Wesley wrote an essay entitled A Plain Account of the People Called Methodist. He describes the same organizational groups, plus another which he called the Class.[22] The Conference Wesley may have omitted from his description of the small groups because it had more to do with deliberations between himself and his preachers than with the activities of his followers.

The body of penitents described with the other elements of Methodism met apart from the others for the sole purpose of hearing Wesley's preaching, and therefore should be considered as an incidental--though important--part of the basic organizational structure of the Methodism of John Wesley. The exclusion of this group by Wesley in subsequent descriptions of his organization and by

biographers and historians in general, gives the organization of Wesley's Methodism this form: The Conference, which functioned as a governing body for the Methodists; the Society, which became synonymous with local congregation; the Class, which functioned as a heterogeneous small group having mandatory membership under strong leadership; the Band, a homogeneous small group with intense interaction patterns; and the Select Company, a small group whose members were to have demonstrated maturity in their Christian experience. Stated in this order, the various groups have a descending structural relationship to each other. Of these, the Conference best reveals Wesley's control over his followers, and the Band best demonstrates the conditioning effect of membership.

The Conference: Governance in Methodism

Wesley not only named the apparent purpose of the Conference as that of advice-giving, but, at the same time, inadvertently suggested an ultimate achievement for this group, that of governing Methodism, when he said, concerning the first Conference, "Observe: I myself sent for these of my own free choice. And I sent for them to advise, not govern, me."[23]

Although Wesley affirmed that he was not to be controlled by the members of the Conference, and in fact was not bound by their decisions, he ultimately saw the worth of the Conference as a governing body for all his Methodists. In a letter dated 1780, in which he sought to clarify the status of the Conference, Wesley mentioned not only its early limitations of power but also its future role:

> And you may observe, they had no power at all, but what I exercised through them. I chose to exercise the power which God had given me in this manner, both to avoid ostentation, and gently to habituate the people to obey them when I should be taken from their head.[24]

The Band Meeting: A Representative Small Group in Methodism

John Wesley, no doubt sensing the worthiness of a closer union in which his Methodists could pour out their hearts without reserve, instituted the Band system in all his societies by 1738.[25]

The groups had no less than five and no more than ten members.[26] The members of each Band were of a common sex--"married men met together in one Band, married women in others; single men and single women had Bands of their own."[27] This arrangement produced greater freedom of expression and fuller help.

The typical Band meeting took place each week; punctuality was stressed; singing or prayer preceded a discussion period. The leader spoke his mind first, and then asked the others one at a time, as many searching questions as he could "concerning their state, sins, and temptations."[28] The questions asked of the members at every meeting indicate the subject matter of the meetings:

1. What known sins have you committed since the last meeting?
2. What temptation have you met with?
3. How were you delivered?
4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?[29]

The questions asked of anyone desiring membership in the Bands indicate the procedures of the meeting. These were asked only once of each new member:

5. Has no sin, inward or outward, dominion over you?
6. Do you desire to be told of your faults?
7. Do you desire to be told of all your faults, and that plain and (true)?
8. Do you desire that every one of us should tell you, from time to time, whatsoever is in his heart concerning you?
9. Consider! Do you desire that we should tell you whatsoever we think, whatsoever we fear, whatsoever we hear concerning you?
10. Do you desire that in doing this, we should come as close as possible, that we should cut to the quick, and search your heart to the bottom?
11. Is it your desire and design to be on this, and all other occasions, entirely open, so as to speak everything that is in your heart without exception, without disguise, and without reserve?[30]

The Band meetings brought back the confessional which had been lost by Protestants. In the tradition of the confessional, what was said in these gatherings was kept in strictest confidence. Tickets were issued by Wesley to those whom he thought "sufficiently recommended" for continued membership.[31]

Because of the strict code of conduct and the close method of enforcement, at the level of Band meeting Methodism tended to break down. Wesley sensed the danger and commanded his followers not to neglect attendance at the Band. It is not surprising that the strength of Methodism was attributable to the devotion of the Band members to their search for perfection.

At the beginning Wesley moved from one level of his organization to another at will, here investigating the moral condition of the members of a Band, there inquiring as to the effectiveness of a leader, and again encouraging members of a Society not to forsake attendance at the Band meetings. His control was absolute, and as the century progressed he maintained his control. But as the movement grew, carefully selected leaders were chosen from the rank and file to share some of the responsibility of overseeing the work. As in the case of the general membership of the societies, these leaders also constituted a unique audience for Wesley's ideas. Moreover, the holding of key positions of influence rendered the leaders of supreme importance.

W. J. Warner estimates that the leadership of Methodism numbered some two hundred and twenty first generation preachers,[32] two thousand local preachers,[33] and approximately eight thousand leaders of small groups,[34] though doubtless this estimate is of the last years of Wesley's leadership.

Methodism as an audience for Wesley's pamphlet rhetoric was important because of his close control over opinion and action of a nationwide community, and the representative nature of that community. As Methodism grew, its leavening effect upon the nation also increased, not only among the middle class and the poor, but increasingly with the upper class as well.

The issues that moved Wesley to write pamphlets and public letters were of concern to his opposition and, ultimately, to the nation at large, but his own followers were often the most profoundly affected. And through his followers, in succeeding generations, many of his highest ideals were achieved. Through them some of his biases were to impede progress as well.

III

PAMPHLET CONTROVERSY

Although Wesley avowed his primary purpose to be the saving of individual souls,[35] still his concern was to save bodies also; that is, to save men not only for the next world, but for this one as well. In one of his earliest Conferences, God's design in raising up the Methodists was affirmed: "not to form any new sect; but to reform the nation . . . and to spread scriptural holiness over the land."[36] Furthermore, Wesley rejected "solitary religion" that does not trouble with outward works of righteousness, for "the gospel of Christ knows no religion but social; no holiness but social holiness."[37] His insistence upon the doctrines of assurance and of Christian perfection generated a pervasive sense of social responsibility, and a dynamic for the relief of the suffering masses, as well as for the reform of the abuses that made men suffer. For he put emphasis on the activity of love in society as the truest expression of the Christian life.[38]

Wesley's view of reform included only in a minor degree the policy of reforming institutions, and legislation for reform was almost beyond his conception. But the "spread of scriptural holiness" led him to denounce specific evils, and he sought first of all to develop scruples in his converts against participating in them. In this sense his strategy of reform was to multiply the number of people with such consciences. Nevertheless, the great spirit he awakened in England motivated the reforms of the next century, and by means of the system of organization whose power he revealed to them, the lower classes utlimately made their voices effective in Parliament.

Furthermore, Wesley's power in logical demonstration and clarity in exposition, aided by his use of "plain words for plain people," could do no less than impress his wide reading audience of the worth of his ideas. His own Methodists, conditioned as they doubtless were by the strength of the organizational structure of Methodism and by Wesley's pervasive indoctrination in matters of faith and conduct, received a two-fold benefit from his controvery with the hierarchy of the Church of England.[39] First, his arguments over his doctrine and practice (so suspected by the bishops and clergy) gave historical and Biblical foundation to the beliefs of the Methodists. His notions of justification by faith alone, of the assurance of salvation, of Christian perfection and especially of the necessity of works-righteousness in which faith operates upon the ills of society, at length became carefully defined dogma eminently capable of both instruction and comfort. Second, his able defense of Methodism gave his followers a sense of purpose and mission within the Church of England vastly superior to the alternative of dissent. Throughout the eighteenth century and beyond, the Methodists, with their carefully articulated doctrines and their developing sense of purpose, increasingly pervaded the populace at large with ideals of personal betterment and of religious fulfillment. His pamphlets and letters, together with his public utterances, also preserved his Methodists from corrosion within, concerning specifically the divisive influence of both predestination and antinomianism. Through the untiring efforts and increasing prestige of Wesley, his followers at length outlived the most pernicious

private and public attacks upon their beliefs and actions. Ultimately, Wesley's ideal for his church, that of rejuvenation to spiritual life and to concern for the common man, was realized through the evangelical revival, of which is he called the spiritual father.

Wesley's concern for "social religion" thrust him into controversy over such diverse topics as politics, economics and social affairs, war policies and slavery. His pamphlets universally demonstrate the guiding principle of individual responsibility for the alleviation of social ills. His readers often disagreed with his assumptions in political theory and social improvement, for example, but they could not escape his direct pleas for individual honesty and morality in conditions immediately improvable by righteous acts.

Wesley's pamphlets on economic and social reform reflect a practical acquaintance with destitute people. The hungry, the sick and the impoverished he met daily became more significant to him than all theories of social improvement. The government seemed too distant and cold to replace the thoughtful, loving acts of righteous men. He sought to increase the numbers of men with impulses of social betterment through his own actions and testimony. Wesley's attack upon the scourge of slavery thrust the problem upon the populace so dramatically, and at such an opportune time, that abolition was hastened through his efforts.[41]

His views on politics, determined by the Christian ethic of personal responsibility, centered not so much upon injustices and flaws within the system as upon the morality and honesty of persons. Those who govern should do so wisely and well; those who could exercise the franchise should do so, and obey the dictates of a good conscience therein rather than through preferment or gain.

His pamphlets encouraged the people to abhor war as abominable, since it failed the tests of experience and reason as a solution to international problems. He early advised his government to avoid war with the American colonies on the premise that they should enjoy equal liberty with Englishmen. He sensed the enterprise could bring only suffering on both sides. He rightly assessed the impracticality of the conflict because of the indomitable spirit of the Americans. And when he judged the American cause of total independency unjust, his pamphlets buttressed the British mind and spirit as no others could.

A brief review of Wesley's political ideas, as revealed in his published tractates, ideas leading to his position on the War of American Independence, demonstrates his impact on his audiences during that controversy.

Politics and the Rise of Democracy

In politics, Wesley measured all things in the light of the Christian ethic. Although he protested that he was no politician,[42] and demanded that his preachers avoid speaking on current political problems, he spent the greater part of his life deeply involved in political issues, and finally enjoined his preachers to defend the King and Parliament from insidious attack.[43]

He demanded moral rectitude in his followers in the exercise of the franchise and through them, in the populace at large, not only in the unflagging use thereof, but also in the prayerful investigation of the basis and consequences the exercise demanded of the voter in social and political affairs. His pamphlets betray a concern for the political assumptions held by those in places of power,

particularly as these assumptions touched upon such subjects as the origin and nature of civil power, notions of civil liberty, and a concern particularly for the rising discontent of the nation as a result of the spread of those doctrines by pen and pamphlet.

Wesley's activities surrounding the '45 Rebellion speak eloquently of the high value he placed upon the patriotism of English subjects. In a letter to the Mayor of Newcastle, dated September 21, 1745, he affirms his loyalty and his utter dedication to alleviate the problem of Jacobitism: "I cry unto God day by day in public and private to put all his enemies to confusion, and I exhort all that hear me to do the same, and in their several stations to exert themselves as loyal subjects, who so long as they fear God cannot but honour the King."[44] And in the same year, in a pamphlet directed to the nation at large, he enjoins his fellow countrymen to consider the results of conquest by the Pretender, and warns that only the sins of the nation, preoccupation with wickedness, neglect of law and duty could bring the nation to such a dreadful condition.[45]

But specific abuses, such as those relating to elections, brought out Wesley's most scathing public criticism. In this vein, on the eve of an election, June 24, 1747, he wrote against bribery in its most insidious forms and in favor of the member of Parliament who loves his God, his King and his country.[46]

If you are going to vote, spoke Wesley, I hope you have taken no money, that you have received no gift or reward, directly or indirectly, nor any promise on account of your vote in the ensuing election. Surely you hesitate at committing deliberate, willful perjury! If you are guilty already, throw down the "Thirty pieces of Silver or Gold," and say, "Sir, I will not sell Heaven. Neither you, nor all the World is able to pay the Purchase." Even if you have received entertainment, meat or drink on account of your vote besides your actual expenses for time or loss of business, you are perjured still. Consider what you do, "will you sell your soul to the devil for a draught of drink or for a morsel of bread?" Act as if the "Whole Election depended upon your single vote: And as if the Whole Parliament depended (and therein the Whole Nation) on that single person whom you now chuse (sic) to be a Member of it."[47] Above all, concludes Wesley, avoid that man who speaks of loving the Church and does not love the King. If he does not love the King he cannot love God, and if he does not love God, he cannot love the Church. Let others do what they will, you should act as an honest man, loyal subject, lover of country, lover of Church--in a word, a Christian who fears nothing but sin and desires nothing but God.[48]

When Wesley arrived in Bristol March 3, 1756, on the eve of an election, he found "Bristol all in flame; voters and non-voters being ready to tear each other in pieces." He quickly brought together those of his followers who were freemen, and admonished them how they should act, and threw his influence behind the Hon. John Spencer who subsequently was elected.[49] In 1774 Wesley was involved in the famous election in Bristol in which Edmund Burke and Henry Cruger were elected to Parliament. Wesley met the voters of his society and advised them to vote, without fee or reward, for the most worthy candidate. He admonished them to speak no evil against the opposition candidates and to take care that "their spirits were not sharpened against those who voted on the other side."[50]

In the same year John Wilkes was expelled from Commons as a result of his condemnation by the House of Lords for libel and breach of privilege. Wilkes

had been prosecuted for criticizing the King and arrested on a general warrant in 1763. Subsequently he had been instrumental in showing the illegality of such warrants. The entire affair became an effective protest against the usurpation by the Commons of illegal powers, and a stimulus to Parliamentary reform. Wilkes thus served the public interest in three ways since he also took active part in securing freedom for published reports of proceedings in the House of Commons.[51] Wilkes escaped to France to avoid imprisonment for the charge of libel, but in 1768 he returned and was elected member of Parliament for Middlesex. Shortly after, he was imprisoned in King's Bench prison on the old charge of libel. Wilkes' popularity among the people gave rise to great commotion and unrest; crowds gathered outside the prison walls; finally a riot broke out and, in the press, six of the rioters were shot and many others wounded.[52] The Wilkes affair occupied the attention of the court and cabinet for months, but he finally won his freedom after paying a small fine and serving a twenty-two-month sentence. While he remained in prison he was at the height of his fame; money was raised from among his admirers, and his published likenesses were displayed on signboards throughout the kingdom.[53] In a later pamphlet Wesley revealed in vivid language how high the popular feeling ran in favor of Wilkes:

> Hark! Is Hell or Bedlam broke loose? What roaring is that, loud as the waves of the sea? It is the Patriot mob. What do they want with me? Why do they block to my house? Make haste! Illuminate your windows in honour of Mr. Wilkes.[54]

In the middle of these disquieting events, Wesley wrote and published a series of three political pamphlets. The first, Free Thoughts on the Present State of Public Affairs, written and published in 1768,[55] attempted to trace the cause of the present commotions and unrest, and comprises an eloquent defense of the King, his ministers, and Parliament. It refutes the views held by those sympathetic to Wilkes. The second, Thoughts Upon Liberty, published in 1772, defines religious and civil liberty, and claims for England full liberty under the constitution and monarch. In the same year, the third pamphlet, Thoughts Concerning the Origin of Power, refutes the notion of civil power residing in the people and given by them to the rulers by an original contract. It reduces the origin of power to one source, that of God.

In Free Thoughts on the Present State of Public Affairs Wesley first affirms his strict impartiality and lack of malevolence in the controversy, and then disclaims expertness in political matters because of the complexity of the facts and the difficulty in accurately reasoning therefrom. You may claim the ability to "instruct both the King and his Council" and to reform the State in a moment, pointing out this and that weakness in the ministers of government, even to direct affairs of state abroad. "I grant," Wesley continues, "every Cobbler, Tinker, Porter and Hackney-Coachman can do this. But I am not so deep-learned: while they are sure of every thing, I am in a manner sure of nothing; except of that very little which I see with my own eyes, or hear with my own ears."[56] And, indeed, I have only that information from the public papers, written mostly on one side of the question. You know, he concludes, little is written by masterly writers--"how few of them have such a pen as Junius?"[57] Then, after claiming no bias one way or another, Wesley joins argument on the discontent of the nation, its causes and consequences.

Wesley carefully disposes of the arguments that King George III is a bad King: that for example he lacks character and understanding, he depends too much on the bad counsel of his mother, and his actions, including the giving of

too many pensions to unworthy recipients. "His whole conduct," Wesley concludes, "both in public and private, ever since he began his reign, the uniform tenor of his behaviour, the general course both of his words and actions, has been worthy of an Englishman, worthy of a Christian, and worthy of a King."[58]

To the charge that the King had disregarded so many petitions and remonstrances signed by many citizens, thereby ignoring the "sense of the nation,"[59] Wesley gave close attention. His refutation reveals more of his bias against the ability of the citizenry than of his strength of argument. He first attacks the validity of the petitions on the grounds of their careless distribution. "What a shocking insult it is then on the whole kingdom, to palm these petitions upon us, of which the very subscribers have not read three lines, as the general sense of the nation?"[60] Furthermore, "would not Mr. Pitt remark upon the ability of colliers and keelmen to judge of affairs of state? Let them mind their own work, keep to their pits and keels and leave state affairs to me."[61]

"But the remonstrance," Wesley continues the argument of his opponents, "Surely the King ought to have paid more regard to the remonstrance of the city of London." Not so, he concludes, since he judged its purpose as more to inflame his subjects than to inform himself, and "as to the idle, shameless tale, of his bursting into laughter at the magistrates, any who are acquainted with his majesty's temper would sooner believe he would spit on them."[62]

The argument that the King was served by bad and incompetent ministers, Wesley met directly. "Although I do not defend General Warrants, as in the case of Mr. Wilkes, these are not extraordinary." They have been used for many years with little objection, and are of so little importance that they were never before placed on the list of public grievances.[63] As to the measures relative to the Middlesex election Wesley forbore to defend. But let it be remembered, he enjoined, that there was as much violence on one side as the other, and the right of explusion implies the right of exclusion. And an expelled member is incapable of serving again in the same session. It follows, he argued, that votes given for a disqualified person are null and void. Therefore, if the other candidate had two hundred votes, he had a majority of two hundred.[64] To the argument that if Middlesex is wronged other counties and eventually the nation as a whole may be affected, he replied, "very true, and the sky may fall."[65] Wesley then quotes at length from a speech by Lord Chief Justice Mansfield,[66] thereby buttressing his own position. How can we believe the violent outcry, he concludes, that the nation is oppressed and deprived of liberty?

Regarding the measures recently taken toward America, Wesley remarked, I don't defend them, and I doubt whether any man can defend them, "either on the foot of law, equity, or prudence," but these measures were Mr. George Grenville's, so their merit belongs to him and not the present ministry.[67]

Having disposed of the "imaginary causes" of the present commotions, Wesley then moves to the real causes of ferment among the people. The primary cause, he affirms, is French gold. To Wesley, Wilkes and his sympathizers, moved by covetousness of English as well as French gold, by ambition, pride and envy, driven by resentment, had published addresses, petitions and remonstrances directed nominally to the King but in reality to inflame the people with discontent. So disastrous are the consequences of the actions of these bad men, that "the land will become a field of blood" and "many Englishmen will sheath their swords in each others bowels . . . Then either a commonwealth will ensue, or a Cromwell. One must be: but it cannot be determined which, King W(ilkes) or King Mob."[68]

Wesley saw no solution arising out of an attempt to strike at the false causes set forth by Wilkes, Junius and their sympathizers. To suppose that the King, by any measures whatever, could stop the present commotions, would be to place him in an impossible situation. "Then would Junius and his friends quickly say; 'Sir King know your place!' Es et ipse lignum.' Take your choice! Be King log, or to the block!'" so great would be his concessions.[69]

In the final pages of the pamphlet Wesley strikes directly at Wilkes and Junius. If any solution is workable, he concludes, would it not be "vigorously to execute the laws against incendiaries? Against those, who by spreading all manner of lies, inflame the people even to madness: to teach them, that there is a difference between liberty, which is the glory of Englishmen, and licentiousness, a wanton abuse of liberty, in contempt of all laws, divine and human?"[70] Certainly, Wesley contends, these men should feel that "scandulum regis is as punishable as scandulum magnatum, . . . to slander the King . . . to print and spread that deadly poison among his Majesty's liege subjects . . . is . . . little less than high treason" and "sowing the seeds of rebellion."[71] It is possible, Wesley concludes, that this solution might restore peace, but one cannot affirm that it would. Perhaps God "has a controversy with the land" for the continued neglect of religion on all sides.

Response to Wesley's Free Thoughts came immediately in the form of A Letter to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley; In answer to His Late Pamphlet, published anonymously in 1771.[72] The author proposed that Wesley's arguments were inconclusive, his insinuations unjust, and that his pamphlet merited "the censure of every friend to freedom and the British constitution; and that it (was) only calculated to please a corrupt ministry, and their venal partizans."[73]

Although the writer admits that uneducated men, immersed in business affairs, and those in the lower levels of life do not always judge well in difficult matters relative to the conduct of national affairs, they are "sufficient judges whether their own rights and privileges are attacked, or preserved inviolate; and whether the honour and dignity of the nation is maintained abroad."[74] Furthermore, the writer maintains, "a more pernicious doctrine can scarcely be advanced in a free state, than this: that the people at large should not meddle in the affairs of government."[75]

The writer proceeds to defend fairly the use of petitions and remonstrances as truly representative of the sense of the nation, to upbraid Wesley for pretending to forbear in speaking of Middlesex when he really develops full defense of the government in the affairs, and to refute him as to the responsibility of the present ministry for American problems.

Wesley's statement of the causes of the present commotions, that of French gold and the designs of selfish traitors, the writer categorically denies for lack of evidence. But of Wesley's solution to the ferment in the nation, "to execute the laws against incendiaries," the writer takes exception, and points to the consequences, that "if an unfortunate author, printer, or bookseller, should be prosecuted . . . for any thing that Mr. Attorney General may chuse (sic) to stile (sic) a libel, it will be of very little importance whether the assertions contained in such publications be true or false." Furthermore, too much truth therein will only serve to "increase its criminality: for that is the modern doctrine on this subject."[76]

Therefore, he concludes, Wesley's solution could only lead to the suppression of the liberty of the press, and, since "the Liberty of the Press, and the Liberty of the People, will stand or fall together," the ultimate loss of all liberty.[77]

In his Thoughts Upon Liberty, published a few months later, Wesley agreed that to restrain the licentiousness of the press might prove a "remedy worse than the disease,"[78] and that by law a man is punishable for "publishing even the truth to the detriment of his neighbour," but he who writes palpable lies to breed dissension between the King and his subjects ought to be punished by a law such as the ancient "leasing-making" law of Scotland, where such lies became a capital crime, claims Wesley, what pity there should not be such a law enacted in this session of Parliament.[79]

Wesley asserts that the people have been so confused by the public attacks on the King and his ministers that they no longer know the true meaning of liberty. "What is liberty?" he asks, "The word is capable of many senses, and possibly it may not be equally desirable in every sense of the word." Religious liberty is a liberty to choose one's own religion, to worship God according to conscience. Civil liberty is a liberty to enjoy life, fortune and property--whatever is legally owned, according to one's choice .[80] But because of the present furor there is such an "inseparable connection between Wilkes and Liberty,"[81] he writes, that even though the English nation enjoys religious and civil liberty in a measure never known before, it is not enough. "This will never satisfy the bellua multorum capitum. That many-headed beast, the People, roars for Liberty of another kind." They want the liberty of plunder, murder and of attacking their neighbors' wives and daughters, and, "not a few, the Liberty of murdering their Prince," he warns,[82] because they have been fed poison. The "best of princes" is represented as the worst; pamphlets make the King odious in the eyes of his subjects; and letters written in "fine language, and with exquisite art" are "filled with the gall of bitterness," and though Junius deny it, Wesley charges, these too are aimed at the King.[83] Surely, concludes Wesley, only a want of understanding could excuse a cry for more religious liberty, only ignorance could produce a plea for greater civil liberty when we are robbed of neither.[84]

The pamphlet, a sturdy defense of the status quo, draws heavily on historical fact for contrast, and at this period any comparison with the past would brighten present conditions. "Let us not," Wesley warns finally, "provoke the King of Kings to take away" such liberty as we presently enjoy, for "By one stroke, by taking to himself that prince whom we know not how to value, he might change the scene, and put an end to our civil as well as religious liberty."[85]

In a pamphlet entitled Thoughts Concerning The Origin of Power, Wesley boldly confronts the argument that the people have the right of disposing supreme power in every age and nation.[86] He surveys governments in power from the monarchy to the democracy, and though he claims that all forms are eventually "swallowed up either in monarchy or aristocracy, his primary question is "not in whom this power is lodged, but from whom it is ultimately derived."[87] He affirms his belief in the validity of existing forms in these words:

> Now I cannot but acknowledge, I believe an old book, commonly called the Bible, to be true. Therefore I believe, There is no power but from God; Rom. xiii. 1. The powers that be, are ordained of God. There is no subordinate power in any nation, but what is derived from the supreme power therein. So in England the king, in the United Provinces the states are the foundation of all power. And there is no supreme power, no power of the sword, of life and death, but what is derived from God, the Sovereign of all.[88]

To those who posit supreme power as the natural right of the people, derived from a supposed original contract, he asks a well-nigh unanswerable question: "Why then should not every man, woman, and child, have a voice in placing their governors?"[89] It is not reasonable, he argues, that if all power is derived from the people, supposing that England is made up of eight millions of people, one half are excluded because of sex and two millions more because of age, and the balance is reduced for want of money or property, that "the people are the source of power," if by "the people they mean scarce a tenth part of them."[90]

After forcing his opposition to embrace universal suffrage as a logical consequence of their position, Wesley then appeals to historical fact, from which he demonstrates that at no time did the people of England give supreme power to its rulers,[91] "if we mean thereby, though not all the people, yet a great majority of them."[92] The supposition that the people are the origin of power is in every way indefensible, Wesley argues:

> It is overturned by the very principle on which it is supposed to stand, namely, that a right of chusing (sic) his governors belongs to every partaker of human nature . . . not to freeholders alone, but to all men; not to men only, but to women also: Not to adult men and women, to those who have lived one and twenty years, but to those who have lived eighteen or twenty, as well as those who have lived three-score.[93]

But none have maintained this to be true, nor is it likely that any will, so the argument falls to the ground, he concludes, so "common sense brings us back to the grand truth, There is no power but of God."[94]

Thus, in the scope of a few years, Wesley laid a foundation of political theory which bound him to the status quo, at once committing him and his followers to a denial of the principles of democracy, and moving him close to the doctrine of divine right. On ensuing issues, particularly the war of American Independence, Wesley steadfastly judged all things in the light of the Christian ethic, that all power derived from God, and that the conduct of the governed is properly a passive submission to the government in power.

The War of American Independence

"It is amazing," says Maldwyn Edwards, "that nobody has thought of dealing fully with Wesley's part in the War of American Independence. No layman was so prominent, nor had so great an influence."[95] Why should Wesley have been so deeply interested in the question? Doubtless his memories of the colonies and the later conquest of America by the Methodist preachers in 1769 and Francis Asbury in 1771 prompted his concern, and may explain his early allegiance to the colonies. But his intense revulsion of war, and his growing ambivalence[96] toward American rights, ultimately provoked his judgment in letter and pamphlet.

Wesley's concern and subsequent change in attitude may be traced through his early letter to Lord Dartmouth, to the Calm Address to our American Colonies, 1775, his more pacific Seasonable Address to Inhabitants of Great Britain, 1776, his direct reply to Dr. Price in Some Observations on Liberty, 1776, and with his Calm Address to Inhabitants of England, 1777. Furthermore, his pronouncements caused a storm of discussion, some hostile, showing clearly the wide public interest he aroused.

On the subject of war itself, Wesley gave an account in his tract, The Doctrine of Original Sin, 1756, which ridicules its folly and exposes its wickedness:

> There is a still more horrid reproach to the Christian name, yea, to the name of man, to all reason and humanity. There is war in the world! . . . Now, who can reconcile war, I will not say to religion, but to any degree of reason or common sense?[97]

Among the chief causes of war he includes the ambition of princes, the corruption of ministers, and differences of opinion, often on petty issues. This "amazing way of stilling controversies" he quickly reduces to the absurd. "and surely," he concludes, "all our declamations on the strength of human reason, and the eminence of our virtues, are no more than the cant and jargon of pride and ignorance, so long as there is such a thing as war in the world."[98]

When Wesley observed heightened hostilities between England and America, March 1, 1775, he wrote his brother Charles, "As to public affairs, I wish you to be likeminded with me. I am of neither side and yet of both; on the side of New England and of Old . . . Faults there may be on both sides, but such as neither you or I can remedy."[99]

But on June 14, 1775, when he felt the war was imminent, he wrote to Lord Dartmouth, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reluctance for seeming to concern himself with things outside his province, "I think that silence in the present case would be a sin against God, against my country, and against my soul."[100] After giving his qualifications to speak knowledgeably on the subject and admitting his prejudices against the Americans because of his high church training in "the highest notions of passive obedience and non-resistance," Wesley presents three arguments against using force against the Americans. First, "I cannot avoid thinking (if I think at all) that an oppressed people asked for nothing more than their legal rights, and that in the most modest and inoffensive manner which the nature of the thing would allow."[101] Second, "whatever has been affirmed, these men will not be frightened. And it seems they will not be conquered so easily as was first imagined." To conceive them as no match for our superior strength is fallacious; to underestimate their unity of purpose and strong determination is folly.[102] Finally, he demonstrates that England is neither strong nor united; that the scarcity of provisions and depression of trade, reminiscent of the times of the Great Rebellion, have made the English people "ripe for open rebellion" wanting only a leader.[103] The letter is an able and eloquent appeal for a conciliatory policy towards America, evidence that Wesley saw clearly what few perceived throughout the struggle, that the "inexpedient could be lawful and that measures right in theory might be disastrous in practice." Although Wesley later argued away his own intuition, he at least realized the true strength of the colonies.[104]

Even as Wesley cautioned those in power against the danger of war, the struggle began. And, once England committed herself to war, this Toryism placed him on the side of the government. A more important influence on his shift of opinion, however, was Dr. Johnson's Taxation no Tyranny, a general essay with particular application to the colonies. The pamphlet did away with Wesley's Whiggish tendencies and brought him back into the fold of severe Toryism. He said, "as soon as I received more light myself, I judged it my duty to impart it to others."[105] Accordingly, he proceeded to extract the chief arguments from Johnson's treatise and recast them in a more popular form.

Although a casual glance at the Calm Address leads to a conclusion that it is the result of a straight abridgement, as was the case with many popular works Wesley prepared for republication, in most of the passages the changes are sufficient to show that Wesley wrote the Calm Address in full, retaining only the main arguments and almost none of the complex style of Johnson.[106] Wesley deleted Johnson's initial reference to philosophical political theory amounting to several thousand words, and added a lengthy section at the end entirely of his own creation. Wesley's style is direct and informal. Johnson's style, although not heavy or cumbersome, admitted to considerable simplification. Wesley shortened the sentences, turned rounded periods to terse phrases and generally made the pamphlet easier to read.[107]

Although Johnson's pamphlet was published anonymously, Wesley's neglect to acknowledge his indebtedness in his first edition gave rise to attack from his opposition.[108] In succeeding editions, therefore, his preface disclaims plagiarism. He might have disregarded the charges, however, for Dr. Johnson himself directed a letter of praise to him:

> Sir, when I received your commentary on the Bible I durst not at first flatter myself that I was to keep it, having so little claim to so valuable a present . . . I have thanks likewise to return for the addition of your important suffrage to my argument on the American Taxation. To have gained such a mind as yours may justly confirm me in my own opinion. What effect my paper has had on the public will I know not: but I have no reason to be discouraged. The Lecturer was surely in the right, who, though he saw his audience slinking away, refused to quit his chair while Plato stayed.[109]

Regardless of Johnson's purpose whether to impress public opinion or to gain credit for doing so, he was doubtless thankful for the Calm Address, for within three weeks the pamphlet created a sensation in England. The press turned out forty thousand copies almost immediately, and within a few months fifty, or perhaps an hundred thousand copies, in newspapers and otherwise, were dispersed throughout Great Britain and Ireland,"[110] Wesley reported. "The government," Tyerman writes, "were so pleased with his little tract that copies were ordered to be distributed at the doors of all the metropolitan churches."[111]

The thesis of the pamphlet, "Has the English Parliament a right to tax the American Colonies?"[112] places Wesley's argument squarely on the issue of legality. Since an English colony is subject to the conditions of a grant from a higher authority, it follows that the supreme power in England has a legal right to levy a tax against the colonies for any end beneficial to the whole empire, claimed Wesley. If you object that it is the privilege of an Englishman to be taxed only by his own consent as given to his representatives in parliament, and, failing representation, he ought not to be taxed, I object that your argument proves too much, Wesley concludes. For if parliament has no right to tax you, she has no right to impose any laws. But you have never disputed this power, and the reception of any law "draws after it by a chain which cannot be broken" the necessity of admitting taxation.[113] But I object even more strenuously to the basis of your argument, Wesley continues, that "every freeman is governed by laws to which he has consented," on the premise that it is absolutely false, because in extended dominions only a very small percentage of the people are concerned in making laws. Further, even before we were born laws were made to which we now consent passively. Any other than this kind of consent the condition of civil life simply does not allow.[114]

Against the contention that the colonists are entitled to life, liberty and property by nature; not having ceded to any sovereign power the right to dispose of these without consent, Wesley argues: although the colonists might claim these rights as "naked sons of nature," by continuing to claim all the rights of natural-born subjects the colonists could not boast of original rights. For if their ancestors acknowledged a sovereign and were governed by a charter, they ceded to the King and parliament the power of disposing, without their consent, of their lives, liberties and properties. And parliament did not cede to them a dispensation from obedience or any degree of independence not enjoyed by other Englishmen.[115]

It is true, Wesley continues, that any subjects who form a colony by a lawful charter forfeit no privilege, but what they do not forfeit by any judicial sentence, they may lose by natural effects. By coming to America voluntarily a citizen loses what he had in Europe, since it is plain he has made the exercise of voting, for example, no longer possible. He has reduced himself to the position of one of the innumerable multitude that have no vote.[116]

The argument that since colonists are not represented in parliament they are entitled to free power of legislation in the colonies, Wesley answers that what the ancestors did not bring with them neither they nor their descendants have acquired. They have not, by abandoning their right in one legislature acquired a right to constitute another any more than the multitude in England, who have no vote, have a right to erect a parliament for themselves.[117]

Nor can provincial laws supersede the laws of the King, he asserts, since the legislature of a colony is much like the vestry of a large parish which may lay a tax on its inhabitants and is in turn liable to taxes laid by a superior authority.[118]

Furthermore, Wesley argues, considering the Acts dating from the Restoration, colonies have been considered as part of the Realm of England in point of taxation as everything else, as the following Acts testify:

> 25th, Charles II. Chap. 7, expressly relates to the colonies; and lays several specific duties on commodities <u>exported</u> from the plantations.
>
> 9th Ann, Chap. 10, orders a revenue to be raised in America from the Post-Office.
>
> 9th Ann, Chap. 27, lays a duty on several goods <u>imported</u> into America.
>
> 3rd George II. Chap. 28, lays a duty on all Rice exported from Carolina, to the South of Cape Finisterre.
>
> 8th Geo. II. Chap. 19, extends the same to Georgia.
>
> 6th Geo. II. Chap. 13, lays several duties on Rum, Sugar and Mollasses <u>imported</u> into North America.[119]

By observing these arguments, concludes Wesley, the impartial reader will allow that the English Parliament has an undoubted right to tax all the English Colonies.

Wesley then inquires why the "hurry and the tumult" for independence, particularly in view of the assistance rendered to the colonies in their recent need.[120] The mother country had laid a small tax upon them for partial reimbursement for her large expense, but how could this reasonable action have set all America in a flame? I will tell you my opinion on the matter, Wesley continues, we have a few men in England who are determined enemies of the Monarchy. They hate the office of the King and have for some years been undermining it with all diligence. These steadfastly pursue its demise through inflammatory papers, published at large, bringing thousands of people to the pitch of madness on the subject. I have no doubt that these are the men who cause the present breach between England and the colonies. They hope to bring about the total defection of North America from England and thereby overturn the government entirely.[121]

Wesley concludes his appeal by describing the advantages of English rule, "what more liberty can you have? What more religious liberty can you desire . . . what civil liberty can you desire, than that which you enjoy already?" Do not the colonies "sit without restraint, every man under his own vine?" Does not each enjoy the fruit of his own labor? "This is real, rational liberty, such as enjoyed by Englishmen alone; and not by any other people in the habitable world. Would the being independent of England make you more free? Far, very far from it."[122] Wesley's final plea is a further condemnation of those whom he sees at work in England attempting to undermine the crown: "Brethren open your eyes! Come to yourselves! Be no longer the dupes of designing men . . . who have laid their scheme so deep, and covered it so well . . . ."[123]

In affirming the legal justice of taxation, John Wesley denied the Americans the privilege of representation. In questioning the validity of exemption from taxation through charters, and in describing the civil and religious liberty and the perfect freedom of the colonists in obeying laws that are just and good under the Sovereignty of England, Wesley opened the flood gates of reaction.

Along with the charge of plagiarism, which Wesley corrected in the second and succeeding editions of the Calm Address to our American Colonies, and the charge of his being a turncoat, which he frankly admitted, two other specific charges were levelled at Wesley out of the general vilification of his opponents: that he looked for a pension or for preferment in the Church, and that he sought to inflame men's minds.

The charge that he wrote for worldly gain was a serious one. Augustus Toplady, in a particularly obnoxious pamphlet quoted Wesley's imagined cogitations, "But, who knows, whether in the borrow'd Plumes of Dr. Johnson, I may not perchance, obtain a Pension, if not slip into an English Cathedral; or (at least) be appointed to the first American Bishoprick?"[124] And preferment, together with a certain sacrifice of integrity could be the only result of Wesley's actions, according to the closing words of an anonymous writer: "As I have formerly seen you, with pleasure, in the character of a Christian Minister, doing some good in the moral world; so it is with regret I now see you in the character of a court sycophant, doing much more mischief in the political world, . . . perhaps irreparably injuring your country."[125]

Horace Walpole reflected the view of many when he asserted, "The artful patriarch of the Methodists . . . produced the 'Calm Address' in order to court his patron, Lord Dartmouth; since he probably hoped either for a deanery or a bishopric."[126]

It is true that one of the highest officers of state called on Wesley and asked whether the government could in any way be of service to either himself or his people. Wesley replied that he "looked for no favours, and only desired the continuance of civil and religious privileges." But when the emissary pressed him, suggesting that Wesley might have "some charities which are dear to you; by accepting £50 from the privy purse, to appropriate as you may deem proper, you will give great pleasure to those for whom I act," his offer was accepted. But, "Mr. Wesley," says Adam Clarke, who related the story, "expressed himself to me as sorry that he had not requested to be made a royal missionary, and to have the privilege of preaching in every church."[127] But Wesley's own account of his motives denies that he wrote for money or for preferment of any kind.[128]

The charge that he wrote to inflame men's minds defied explanation, so evident was the general reaction to his pamphlet. Wesley made the attempt, however, in his Letter to the Editor of Lloyd's Evening Post, November 29, 1775:

> Least of all did I write with a view to inflame any; just the contrary. I contributed my mite toward putting out the flame which rages over the land. This I have more opportunity of observing than any other man in England. I see with pain to what an height this already rises in every part of the nation. And I see many pouring oil into the flame by crying out, 'How unjustly, how cruelly the King is using the poor Americans, who are only contending for their liberty and for their legal privileges!'[129]

He argues that the only way to quench the flame is to show that the Americans are not being used cruelly or unjustly, that they already enjoy liberty, both civil and religious. Further, the Americans contend for an illegal privilege, exemption from parliamentary taxation, a privilege no charge ever gave. They are incited to "seize upon all the Kings' officers" and to "stand valiantly only for six months, and in that time there will be such commotions in England that you may have your own terms." This is the real state of the question, Wesley concludes, so "what impartial man can either blame the King or commend the Americans? With this view, to quench the fire, by laying the blame where it was due, the Calm Address was written.[130]

But attacks on Wesley's integrity were ineffectual and petty when compared to the honest questions raised by thoughtful men on his interpretation of facts and laws, together with his assumptions on liberty, as these related to the Americans.

Wesley's argument that since an English colony is subject to the conditions of a grant from higher authority and hence the Americans are taxed legally by the supreme power of the empire, was called "confused and contradictory."[131] He was charged with failing to make clear whether charters were given by the monarch alone or by the whole legislature. Since charters cannot issue from the mere will of the King, being essentially an "agreement or compact between the King and his people, to govern them by their own consent,"[132] supreme power for such charters must reside elsewhere. "In England, that power is lodged in the King, Lords and Commons" conjointly, "because an absolute grant or charter from the King would operate to destroy the connection between . . . the people, and their representatives in Parliament; and having destroyed that, it would go so far to destroy the principles of representation, and thus the king might at length become absolute."[133] The right of the Americans to tax themselves

is sufficiently clear since they have exercised an independent power of legislation for nearly two centuries. A token superiority ought to be allowed the mother country, as has been happily effected through the act of nagivation, but this "we should observe is not a matter of right, but of political necessity."[134] Further, it can be allowed that the supreme power has a right to tax the Americans if it consists of "the King, Council, and Assembly in the different colonies."[135] To speak of any other kind of prerogative is only to add to the present confusion, for it cannot be proved that the "supreme power in England, have a just right to tax the Americans, any more than that the supreme power in America may tax Great Britain."[136]

Wesley's argument that consent is not necessary for levying taxation any more than it is needed to pass laws, that "every sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects, that is, to grant their property, with or without their consent," Americanus meets directly: "Wherein consists the difference betwixt slavery and liberty?"[137] How can one sit under his own vine when another claims a right of taking it from him without his consent? Wesley was reminded that the people and the Commons originated all measures of taxation:

> Were the executive power, that is the Sovereign, to determine the raising of public money, says the celebrated Montesquieu, otherwise than by giving its consent, (and surely you will not call this a power of taxing) Liberty would be at an end . . . Taxation and Representation (says that able Lawyer and truly great man Lord Camden, in his speech on this Subject) are inseparably united . . . Taxation and Representation are coeval with and essential to this Constitution.[138]

Americanus buttresses his claim by relating statutes that recognized the principle of consent and concludes "there is not . . . a blade of grass, which when taxed, was not taxed by the consent of the proprietor."[139] If it be true, continues Americanus, that the people have "ceded to the King and Parliament the power of disposing without their consent, of both their lives, liberties, and properties" how can they "retain their place in the legislature by their representatives, and no act of Parliament is passed but with their consent?"[140]

To Wesley's claim that any other than passive consent the condition of civil life does not allow, Americanus counters, "But if it allows any kind of consent, why talk of our being taxed without our consent, and against our consent,

> unless it be with an artful design to enflame your readers minds against the Americans because they object to having their money disposed of without their own consent, that is without the consent of their representatives in their provincial assemblies.[141]

Americanus affirms that the people are the source of power, denying Wesley's former claim in the pamphlet, Thoughts Concerning the Origin of Power, the sentiments of which together with those of the Calm Address, he calls a revival of the "good old Jacobite doctrine of hereditary, indefeasible, divine right, and of passive obedience and non-resistance."[142]

The author of A Constitutional Answer to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Calm Address to the American Colonies, confronted Wesley's claim that the people ceded power to the King and Parliament, "if they ceded power, they must have possessed it. Nemo dat quod non habet: what a man has not he cannot give to another . . .,"[143] and the argument that natural rights must be given up in

favor of the rights of English citizenship is palpably false.[144] The author of A Full and Impartial Examination of the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Address to the Americans,[145] continues the argument: "Certainly when the people left the State of Nature . . . They must have been infatuated to have given up life, liberty, and property, to the absolute disposal of others . . . This would have been running from all the inconveniences they meant to avoid, by general agreement, into those of the same kind."[146]

But to Wesley's final warning, that a few men in England, determined enemies of the King, are inflaming the populace with incendiary writings, his opponents uniformly responded. Wesley was charged with being one of the "few men" by his words in Free Thoughts on Public Affairs, "I do not defend the measures taken with regard to America, I doubt whether any man can defend them, either on the foot of Law, Equity, or Prudence."[147] That a few men, at a distance of more than two thousand miles, could stir up the discontent of Americans, and confuse to the point of madness thoughtful English subjects was thought incredible.[148] But the author of A Constitutional Answer disbelieved Wesley's own credence in the charge. "It is well known," said he, "that the Republican form does not suit the genius of the nation: still less would it suit the character of the people."[149] I know of no Englishman, he observes, who "hates either the kingly office, or the Prince by whom it is now exercised," but there are "millions of honest Englishmen, who perceive, with inexpressible grief and terror, our Excellent Constitution, planned by the best and wisest of our ancestors . . . gradually deviating from its primitive purity. . . ."[150] These wish not to subvert, but rather to restore the constitution to its "pristine integrity"; however, there are those also, many thousands of Englishmen who are ignorant of what the constitution is and unaware of its violation. These, the Johnsons and the Wesleys "seek to deceive out of their birthright and persuade them they are slaves."[151]

Although Wesley responded directly to Americanus in a supplement to the later editions of his Calm Address, particularly on the question of representation and consent, he reserved most of his answers for pamphlets written in succeeding years.

In 1776 Wesley wrote a pacific pamphlet, A Seasonable Address to the More Serious Part of the Inhabitants of Great Britain, Respecting the Unhappy contest between us and our American Brethren: With an occasional Word Interspersed to those of a different Complexion, by a Lover of Peace.[152] He renews his argument against the horror of fraticidal war and strongly declaims against war as a means of settling any kind of dispute. The pamphlet includes a lengthy description of the grievous suffering that must ensue from the context: "Unhappy: very unhappy for us, we are a kingdom divided against itself; and without a miracle, fall we must!" he cries.[153] He describes an "innumerable train of evils," the sword, fire, plunder and famine necessarily following from the war. What can we do to save our kingdom and to save our American brethren? he asks; what we would do if our neighbor's house were on fire:

> We should bring no combustible matter to increase the flame, but water and a helping-hand to extinguish it . . . and our labour would not be in vain. Now apply this to America and Great Britain. The former is like a house on fire; the devouring flames of an unnatural civil war are already kindled, and some hundreds of lives have fallen prey to its insatiable violence.[154]

How long, he asks, before this may be our lot here, God only knows. Wesley outlines the cause of the bloody war as a matter in dispute relative to the mode of taxation. Who that seriously considers this awful contest can keep lamenting the "astonishing want of wisdom in our brethren to decide the matter without bloodshed:

> . . . are there no wise-men amongst us? None that are able to judge between brethren? But brother goeth to war against brother oh! how are the mighty fallen.[155]

What argument is it, he persists, when countrymen, "children of the same parents," murder each other with all possible haste to see who is in the right?[156]

The causes of the war Wesley finds in the conduct of the Government, but especially in the sinfulness, "the universal impiety," of the people, to whom he addresses fervent words of exhortation to repentance, so that the judgment of God, as he regards the horrors of war to be, may be averted, and mercy may fall on an evil nation.[157] He calls to the "friends of government" and the Americans to turn their eyes from those they suspect to be the "only authors of the present evil," to look in the glass and "see the ugly monster universal sin, that subtle unsuspected serpent that has inflamed our blood,"[158] and, marvelling not at divine permission of these afflictions, "follow the example of the Ninevites" and "break off our sins by repentance."

In the second edition, published later in the same year, Wesley added a postscript in which he laments the divisions that subsist among the citizens as a result of the war,[160] and points to an alarming "symptom of (the) present disorder . . . . The spirit and temper of some reputed professors, who have entered the lists of the present controversy," who leave off "cool and dispassionate argument" and descend to personal attack. Our situation is desperate, Wesley concludes, but I would hope matters are not so far out of hand "that the faithful remnant, by their united, constant and fervent intercession, may stand in the gap . . . and turn aside the greatly deserved and justly dreaded indignation" of God.[161] Thus, as in the voice of a prophet Wesley denounces the people's wickedness and threatens Divine punishment unless by timely contrition and breaking with evil, punishment be avoided.

In February, 1776, Richard Price published his famous Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, and the Justice and Policy on the War with America. The pamphlet, a defense of Shelburne's position arguing in favor of the abandonment of all claims to sovereignty over the Americans except insofar as concerned what Shelburne called "that regulation of trade for the common good of the Empire," repudiated the Whig view as embodied in the Declaratory Act. Price wrote in opposition to Burke and his associates among the Rockingham Whigs, and the popularity his pamphlet received appeared especially alarming at a time when radicalism in England seemed to be advancing to more extreme demands, based, as those of the Americans, upon the idea of natural rights.[162]

In the same year, John Wesley, in a Journal entry, dated April 4, 1776 remarked, I began an answer to that dangerous Tract, Dr. Price's 'Observations Upon Liberty'; which, if practised, would overturn all government, and bring in universal anarchy."[163] That Wesley held Price in high esteem, as did the Americans, is witnessed by his opening remarks in the pamphlet written in response to Price's arguments, Some Observations on Liberty:

> It was with great expectation that I read Dr. Price's "Observations on the Nature of Liberty . . ." and I was not disappointed. As the author is a person of uncommon abilities, so he has exerted them to the uttermost in the tract before us, which is certainly a masterpiece of its kind. He has said all that can be said upon the subject, and has digested it in the most accurate manner; and candour requires us to believe that he has wrote (sic) with an upright interest of mankind in general, as well as the subjects of the British empire.[164]

Wesley proceeded to extend the argument against American claims he had previously set forth in his Calm Address to Our American Colonies and in his Thoughts Upon Liberty, that the Americans, even though they had forfeited their rights of representation, still have civil and religious liberty, and the perfect freedom of obeying laws which are just and good. "What kind of liberty do they enjoy?" Wesley asks Dr. Price, "Here you puzzle the cause, by talking of physical and moral Liberty . . . both . . . are beside the present question; and introducing them can answer no end, than to bewilder and confuse the reader." Civil liberty and religious liberty the Confederate Colonies presently enjoy undisturbed, Wesley avers, and although the King and Parliament, the supreme power of the country, can take them away, they do not. "But the truth is," he continues, "What they claim is not liberty: It is Independency . . . . A while ago they vehemently denied this; for matters were not then ripe; and I was severely censured, for supposing they intended any such thing. But now the mask is thrown off: They frankly avow it; and Englishmen applaud them for so doing!"[165] But you wish to prove that not only the Colonies, but all mankind have a right to it, Wesley charges, "Yea, that independency is of the very essence of Liberty; and that all who are not independent are slaves."[166] If this be so, Wesley concludes, "if all who are not independent are slaves then there is no free nation in Europe."[167]

Wesley then confronts Price's prime argument that the Americans ought to be independent because they presently number nearly half the English population and will, by another century, number twice as many. "The argument runs thus," explains Wesley:

> If the Americans are half as many as the English, then they have a right to be independent. But they are half as many; therefore 'they have a right to be independent.' I deny the consequence in the first proposition: Number does not prove a right to independency. I deny the second proposition too: They are not half as many; even though you swell the number of the Americans, as much as you diminish the number of the English.[168]

Wesley then contradicted Dr. Price's assertion that the population of England had decreased: "I make no doubt, but the English, (beside three millions of Scots and Irish) are ten millions at this day." If you say "How can that be, when there are only six hundred thousand in London?" I answer, "Believe it who can, I cannot believe there are so few as fifteen hundred thousand in London and its environs, allowing only two miles every way, from the walls of the city" and, though the computation was made in the late reign allowing but an average of five people in each house, I answer:

> They who made this allowance, probably fix their computation at their own fireside. They do not walk through every part of the town, up to the garrets, and down in the cellars. I do: And by what I have

> seen with my own eyes, frequently fifteen, eighteen or twenty in one house, I cannot believe there are fewer, at an average, than ten under one roof; and the same I believe of Bristol, Birmingham, Sheffield, and most other trading towns. Besides, how many thousand of houses have been added to London with in these thirty or forty years?[169]

Wesley rejects the argument that the towns and villages were decreasing except exceeding few. "I know to the contrary," he affirms, "having an opportunity of seeing ten times more of England, every year than most men in the nation."[170] It is no wonder the population should increase, Wesley continues, considering the "amazing increase of trade which has been lately, not in London only, but much more in Bristol, Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds, Manchester, and, indeed all parts of the Kingdom, which I have had the opportunity of observing."[171]

Wesley then turns to the argument of universal suffrage, which he calls a chimera not to be found anywhere on earth, "although . . . these subtle metaphysical pleas for universal independency appear beautiful in speculation; yet it never was, neither can be reduced to practice. It is vain to attempt it, Sensus moresque repugnant atque ipsa utilitas, justi prope mater et aequi."[172] If "All civil government, as far as it is free is a creature of the people . . . What do you mean by the people" he asks? If these be but a tenth part of the population the argument cannot be defended by even Mr. Locke himself.[173] And since none have ever maintained this nor probably ever will, "common sense brings us back to the ground truth, There is no power but of God."[174] To offer your kind of liberty is dangerous enough, but "to inflame them still more, you go on," charges Wesley, "liberty is more or less complete, according as the people have more or less share in the government." Nothing could be more contrary to fact, he rejoins, "the greater share the people have in government, the less liberty, either civil or religious, does the nation enjoy. Accordingly, there is most liberty of all, civil and religious, under a limited monarchy; There is usually less under an aristocracy, and least of all under a democracy."[175] When you say "to be guided by one's own will, is freedom; to be guided by the will of another is slavery," you approach the "very quintessence of re-publicanism" Wesley charges, for, if this is true, "how free are all the devils in hell? seeing they are all guided by their own will: And what slaves are all the angels in heaven? Since they are all guided by the will of another!"[176] And when you say "the people have power to model government as they please . . . (and) government is a trust and all its powers a delegation," I counter that "It is a trust, but not from the people: There is no power but of God. It is a delegation, namely from God: for rulers are God's ministers or delegates."

Wesley reminds Dr. Price that his arguments relative to representation and consent in matters of taxation as applied to the Americans betrays his former argument for independency, and concludes the pamphlet charging Dr. Price with deliberate inflammatory writing:

> Two or three years ago, by means of incendiary papers, spread throughout the nation, the minds of the people were inflamed to an amazing degree: But the greater part of the flame is now gone out. The natural tendency, or rather, the avowed design of this pamphlet, is to kindle it again: If it be possible, to blow up into a flame the sparks that yet remain; to make the minds of his Majesty's subjects, both at home and abroad, evil-affected toward his government; discontented in the midst of plenty; out of honour with God and man; to

> persuade them, in spite of all sense and reason, that they are absolute slaves, while they are actually possessed of the greatest Civil and Religious liberty that the condition of human life allows.[177]

Appealing to the nation at large, Wesley calls for the use of every lawful means to put out the flame of rebellion against the King and to labor to improve liberty in religion by practicing pure religion, and to improve civil liberty by devotion to the honorable service of the monarch.[178]

On February 3, 1777 Wesley went to Bristol, and "hearing there was some disturbance . . . occasioned by men whose tongues were set on fire against the government," enjoined his audiences "to be subject to principalities and powers, to speak evil of no man." But finding repeated attempts to set fire to the city had occasioned a "general consternation," he wrote A Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England in hope of the "quenching of that evil fire which is still among us."[179] Wesley traces the course of recent events in America, and the rise of the rebellion there. He accuses America's numerous friends in England of writing letters; which were in turn dispersed throughout the provinces, containing the encouragement, "make no concessions: give up nothing. Stand your ground. Be resolute, and you may depend upon it, in less than a year and a half, there will be such commotions in England, that the government will be glad to be reconciled to you, upon your own terms."[180] These encouragements proved to be prophetic, claims Wesley, and "many warm men at home, laboured to embarrass the government in all its measures."[181] Not only did these men frustrate the actions of Parliament, sparing not the King himself, Wesley continues, but they were so "wonderfully tender of the Americans, that they would not in any wise term them Rebels, though they were in open arms against their lawful sovereign."[182] And, as the Americans became successful, Wesley recounts, the "talk of Liberty was over. Independency was the word . . . without disguise or reserve . . . indeed, Liberty was come to an end . . . . If any one dared to speak a little in favour of the King or in disfavour of the Congress, he was soon taught to know his Lords and Masters, whose little finger was heavier than the loins of Kings."[183] Wesley alludes to the long history of American hopes for independence which was just now coming under public scrutiny:

> In the year 1737 my Brother took ship, in order to return from Georgia to England. But a violent storm drove him up to New-England; and he was for some time detained at Boston. Even then he was surprised, to hear the most serious people, and men of consequence, almost continually crying out, 'We must be independent: we shall never be well, till we shake off the English yoke![184]

He then describes the scattering of American armies, the loss of forts and strongholds, and concludes that since the English sought help from God, there had been a "manifest blast" upon the Americans.[185] His pamphlet contrasts the perfect liberty, civil and religious, enjoyed in England with the absence of it in America, and exhorts the people, especially the religious portion, whether of the Church of England, dissenters, or Methodists, to prize highly their privileges, and not to speak evil of the government but to "be subject to the higher powers."[186] Wesley concludes with a warning to the troublemakers in Bristol, "what if the present Government should continue," in spite of your rebellion, "have you any assurance . . . that our governors will always be patient? Nay, undoubtedly when things of greater moment are settled, they will find time for you. Your present behaviour will then be remembered; perhaps not altogether to your advantage: it is not ignorance, but the wisdom of your governors, which occasions their present silence."[187]

The pamphlet is the last important pronouncement of Wesley on the struggle. It reflects intolerance and prejudice in one whose influence was at its zenith. "The more statesmanlike, broadminded Wesley of the conflicts' early days was forgotten," observes Maldwyn Edwards. "Then his opinion mainly expressed in letters had reached the few alone. Now his later views condensed in pamphlet form spread, as a prairie fire, throughout the length and breadth of England."[188]

Wesley's Calm Address to Our American Colonies did not reach the people for whom it was expressly written. He regretted that "The ports being just then shut up by the Americans I could not send it abroad as I designed."[189] Southey describes circumstances Wesley apparently did not know: "Such, indeed, was the temper of the Americans, that a friend to the Methodists got possession of all the copies of the Calm Address which were sent to New York; and destroyed them, foreseeing the imminent danger to which the (Methodist) preachers would be exposed, if a pamphlet so unpopular in its doctrines should get abroad."[190] The Calm Address, therefore, had no opportunity for the direct exercise of its tranquilizing powers in America. But reports spread from England; and Wesley's conversion to the Tory side of the American question became so well known, and so well recognized was the force of his influence with his own people, that the American Methodists were regarded with suspicion throughout the war. Methodist preachers in particular were suspected by the revolutionary patriots.[191] His American Methodists were forced either to bear the stigma of "Tory" or disassociate themselves as far as possible from their leader. His pamphlets and letters during the period of the war so alienated the American politicans that Francis Asbury, Wesley's chosen superintendent of American Methodism was forced to write: "There is not a man in the world so obnoxious to the American politicans as our dear old Daddy; but no matter, we must treat him with all the respect we can and that is due him."[192] Hence, the Methodists in America were willing to reckon Wesley as their spiritual leader in God, but no longer as their actual leader. In 1786 they quietly dropped his name from the Minutes of the annual conferences, and in 1787 they ignored his explicit directive that Richard Whatcoat be elected superintendent. When Wesley's name reappeared in the Minutes of 1789, a clear distinction was drawn between his spiritual pre-eminence and his practical authority.[193]

In all of his public utterances pertaining to the War of American Independence Wesley looked for an ultimate effect. If all he hoped for had come to pass--if England had united solidly behind George III, if America had been persuaded to submit to royal rule or had been subdued--historians today would doubtless point Wesley out as an instrument in checking a disastrous upheaval. He was dedicated to the status quo, and if that could be maintained, offending and enraging a few insurgents would be an unavoidable but insignificant necessity.

Wesley's view of the American grievances and his wish that the colonies should remain a part of the empire, placed him at odds with the temper of his time, and here he was dealing with forces he could by no means direct. England remained prevailingly Whig, and America went her own way. Although the Calm Address was an effective pamphlet, apparently more effective than Dr. Johnson's essay, the effects of this and the subsequent pamphlet rebuttals on his primary arguments were largely unfortunate. The only measurable results were an increase of party bitterness within England, an augmentation of suspicion and distrust between the Colonies and England, and a multiplication of Methodist difficulties in America. After the termination of the struggle Wesley in effect confessed his error. In a Letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and Our brethren in North America, dated September 10, 1784, he acknowledges that it was by the interposition and

providence of God himself that American independence was achieved. The letter gives full jurisdiction to American Methodist leaders in matters of ecclesiastical control and concludes:

> As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with one or the other. They are now at full liberty, simply to follow the scriptures and the primitive church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty, wherewith God has so strangely made them free.[194]

But if it is true, as Lecky declares, that the pamphlet controversy had "a considerable influence in forming public opinion hostile to all concession,"[195] Wesley shares a grave responsibility. For without the support of a fairly large body of public opinion, the Tory government might not have pursued the course of war. Wesley's wide influence doubtless became one of the effective causes which brought about and prolonged the war of American Independence.

Footnotes

[1]William Edward Hartpole Lecky, A History of England in the Eighteenth Century (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1892), III, 140-141, claims for Wesley "a wider constructive influence in the sphere of practical religion than any other man who has appeared since the sixteenth century." J. H. Plumb, England In The Eighteenth Century (Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1966), 90, sees Wesley as a "man in some ways comparable to Luther, Lenin, Gandhi, or even Napoleon. Few men have had this transcendental capacity to stir the heart; none has combined this with his genius for organization."

[2]Plumb, 90.

[3]Luke Tyerman, Life and Times of John Wesley (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1872), 3 vols. Maximin Piette, John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1937).

[4]E. C. Urwin and Douglas Wollen, John Wesley--Christian Citizen (London: The Epworth Press, 1937), 11.

[5]John Wesley, Some Remarks On A Defense Of The Preface To The Edinburgh Edition Of Aspaseo Vindicated (Edinburgh: Auld and Smellie, 1766), in Wesley, Works, VI, 129. John Wesley, The Works of The Reverend John Wesley, A. M. Edited by John Emory (New York: J. Emory and B. Waugh, 1831), hereafter cited as Wesley, Works, except from later editions or parts thereof, as in The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M., edited by Nehemiah Curnock (London: The Epworth Press, 1938), hereafter, Wesley, Journal, (Curnock); and as in The Letters of the Reverend John Wesley, edited by John Telford (London: The Epworth Press, 1960), hereafter, Wesley, Letters, (Telford).

[6]Ibid., 130.

[7]Albert C. Outler, ed., John Wesley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 385.

[8]Wesley, Works, IV, 437. Wesley doubtless refers here to his Directions Concerning Pronunciation and Gesture (Bristol: W. Pine, 1770).

[9]Ibid., 507.

[10]Ibid., VII, 451.

[11]Alfred North Whitehead, Adventures of Ideas (New York: The American Library, 1955), 29.

[12]W. J. Warner, The Wesleyan Movement In The Industrial Revolution (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), 248.

[13]J. Wesley Bready, England: Before And After Wesley (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1939), 352

[14]Élie Halévy, England in 1815 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1961, 398.

[15]Ibid., 389.

[16]Basil Williams, The Whig Supremacy (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952, 123.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Dorothy Marshall, Eighteenth Century England (New York: David McKay, Co., 1962), 32. See also Plumb, 14-16, and Williams, 138-140.

[19]Plumb, 16.

[20]L. F. Church, More About The Early Methodist People (London: The Epworth Press, 1949), 1-53, gives evidence of such representative membership as professional men, tradesmen, artisans and miners. Plumb, 17, observes that upward mobility became less common as the century progressed.

[21]Clifford W. Towelson, Moravian and Methodist (London: The Epworth Press, 1957), 191. He includes the Minutes of the Conference (1744).

[22]Wesley, Works, V, 177-185.

[23]Ibid., 221.

[24]Ibid., VII, 228.

[25]Ibid., V, 268.

[26]John Telford, The Life Of John Wesley (New York: Hunt and Eaton, n. d.), 153.

[27]Wesley, Works, V, 183.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid., 193.

[30]Ibid., 192.

[31]Wesley, Works, III, 203, and V, 217.

[32]Warner, 249.

[33]Ibid., 261.

[34]Ibid., 262.

[35]Wesley, Works, V, 219.

[36]Cameron, 26.

[37]Wesley, Works, VII, 593.

[38]Ibid.

[39]John Wesley, An Earnest Appeal To Men Of Reason And Religion (Newcastle-upon Tyne: John Gooding, 1743). See also, Wesley, A Farther Appeal To Men Of Reason And Religion (London: W. Strahan, 1745).

[40]John Wesley, Free Thoughts On The Present State Of Public Affairs (London: J. and W. Oliver, 1770). See also, Wesley, Thoughts On The Present State Of Provisions (London: R. Hawes, 1773).

[41]John Wesley, Thoughts Upon Slavery (London: R. Hawes, 1774).

[42]Wesley, Free Thoughts On The Present State Of Public Affairs, 3.

[43]Wesley, Works, VI, 346.

[44]Ibid., III, 351.

[45]Ibid., VI, 365.

[46]John Wesley, A Word To A Freeholder (London: n. p., 1747), 1. See also Wesley, Works, III, 400. Richard Green, The Works of John and Charles Wesley: A Bibliography (London: Richard Green, 1896), reports that at the Conference of 1767 Wesley advised his preachers to "read everywhere the Word to a Freeholder, and disperse it as it were with both hands."

[47]Wesley, A Word To A Freeholder, 2.

[48]Ibid., 4.

[49]Wesley, Works, III, 596. See also T. E. Brigdon, "Wesley and Politics," Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society, XV, 135.

[50]Brigdon, 135.

[51]Edwards, 63.

[52]The exploit was called "The Massacre of St. George's Fields." See Tyerman, III, 37.

[53]Edwards, 63.

[54]John Wesley, Thoughts Upon Liberty (Bristol: n. p., 1772), 16.

[55]A second edition was published in 1770.

[56]Wesley, Free Thoughts On The Present State Of Public Affairs, 4-5.

[57]Ibid., 5.

[58]Ibid., 16.

[59]Ibid., 12.

[60]Ibid., 13.

[61]Ibid., 14.

[62]Ibid., 15.

[63]Ibid., 17.

[64]Ibid., 19.

[65]Ibid., 20.

[66]Speech on a motion made by Lord Chatham "to repeal and rescind the resolutions of the House of Commons in regard to the explusion and incapatation of Mr. Wilkes."

[67]Ibid., 25.

[68]Ibid., 34, 35

[69]Ibid., 45.

[70]Ibid., 46.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Anon. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley: In Answer to His Late Pamphlet (London: J. Towers, 1771). Green, 116, calls the answer a "fair, though caustic reply" to Wesley.

[73]Ibid., 3.

[74]Ibid., 10, 11.

[75]Ibid., 11.

[76]Ibid., 53.

[77]Ibid., 55.

[78]Wesley, Thoughts Upon Liberty, 22.

[79]Ibid., 22.

[80]Ibid., 6, 9, 15.

[81]Ibid., 5.

[82]Ibid., 18.

[83]Ibid., 2. Tyerman, III, 145, reports that "when the Letters of Junius appeared, Wesley offered his services to the government, and proposed to answer them, saying, 'I will show the difference between rhetoric and logic.'"

[84]Ibid., 15.

[85]Ibid., 23.

[86]John Wesley, Thoughts Concerning The Origin Of Power (Bristol: W. Pine, 1772), 5.

[87]Ibid., 4.

[88]Ibid., 5.

[89]Ibid., 6.

[90]Ibid., 9.

[91]Ibid., 9, 10.

[92]Ibid., 11.

[93]Ibid., 11, 12.

[94]Ibid., 12.

[95]Edwards, 70.

[96]Ibid., 71. Edwards, among others, blames Wesley's Toryism for his shift of opinion.

[97]Wesley, Works, V, 511.

[98]Ibid., 512.

[99]Wesley, Letters (Telford), VI, 143.

[100]Ibid., 155. See also Hist. MSS Commission, Dartmouth, 378. Wesley sent a slightly abridged version of the letter to Lord North, First Lord of the Treasury, on the following day, Wesley, Letters (Telford), VI, 160.

[101]Ibid., 156.

[102]Ibid., 156-167.

[103]Ibid., 159.

[104]Edwards, 73.

[105]John Wesley, A Calm Address To Our American Colonies, 2nd edition (London: n. p., 1775), preface, "Address to the Reader." See also Wesley, Works, VI, 293.

[106]Thomas Herbert, John Wesley As Editor and Author (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), 106.

[107]Ibid., 107.

[108]In his Calm Address to our American Colonies, New Edition, 2, Wesley credits Taxation no Tyranny as the source of his main arguments.

[109]Gentleman's Magazine, XVII, Part 1, 455.

[110]Tyerman, III, 191.

[111]John Wesley, A Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England (London: J. Fry and Co., 1777), 2.

[112]Wesley, A Calm Address to our American Colonies, 3.

[113]Ibid., 6.

[114]Ibid., 6, 7.

[115]Ibid., 7.

[116]Ibid., 7, 8.

[117]Ibid., 8.

[118]Ibid., 9.

[119]Ibid., 10.

[120]The contest for American empire between England and France, see Marshall, 422.

[121]Wesley, A Calm Address to our American Colonies, 11, 12.

[122]Ibid., 12.

[123]Ibid., 13.

[124]Augustus Toplady, An Old Fox Tarr'd and Feather'd (London: n.p., 1775), 5. Wesley bitterly responded to Toplady in public print, "As to reviewers, newswriters, London Magazines, and all that kind of gentlemen, they behaved just as I expected they would. And let them lick up Mr. Toplady's spittle still, a champion worthy of their cause." Wesley, Letters (Telford), VI, 193.

[125]Anon., A Constitutional Answer to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Calm Address to the American Colonies (London: Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775), 22.

[126]George Trevelyan, The American Revolution, New Edition (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909), III, 270.

[127]Tyerman, III, 191.

[128]Lloyd's Evening Post, 1775, quoted in Wesley, Letters (Telford), VI, 192.

[129]Wesley, Letters (Telford), VI, 192, 193.

[130]Ibid.

[131]W. D., A Second Answer to Mr. John Wesley (London: Wallis and Stonehouse, 1775), 9.

[132]Ibid., 10.

[133]Ibid., 11.

[134]Ibid., 15.

[135]Ibid.

[136]Ibid.

[137]Americanus, A Letter to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley Occasioned by his Calm Address to the American Colonies (Bristol: n.p., 1775), 3, 4. His argument on Mansfield's doctrine of "virtual representation" is not answered by Wesley.

[138]Ibid., 5.

[139]Ibid., 6.

[140]Ibid., 8.

[141]Ibid.

[142]Ibid., 11.

[143]Anon., A Constitutional Answer . . ., 8.

[144]Ibid., 9.

[145]Anon., A Full and Impartial Examination of the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Address to the Americans (1775), By a Friend to the People and Their Liberties.

[146]Ibid., 17.

[147]Americanus, 22.

[148]Anon., A Full and Impartial Examination . . ., 19.

[149]Anon., A Constitutional Answer . . ., 19.

[150]Ibid., 20.

[151]Ibid.

[152]John Wesley, A Seasonable Address to the More Serious Part of the Inhabitants of Great Britain, Respecting the Unhappy contest between us and our American Brethren: With an occasional Word Interspersed to those of a different Complexion (Bristol: n.p., 1776), Second Edition.

[153]Ibid., 3.

[154]Ibid., 5.

[155]Ibid., 7.

[156]Ibid.

[157]Ibid., 15.

[158]Ibid., 16.

[159]Ibid., 17.

[160]Ibid., 19.

[161]Ibid., 22.

[162]Max Beloff, ed., The Debate on the American Revolution, 1761-1783 (London: Nicholas Kaye, Ltd., 1949), 265. See also Wesley, Journal (Curnock), VI, 100n.

[163]Wesley, Journal (Curnock), VI, 100.

[164]John Wesley, Some Observations on Liberty (Edinburgh: n.p., 1776), 3. See also Wesley, Works, VI, 301n.

[165]Ibid., 5.

[166]Ibid.

[167]Ibid.

[168]Ibid., 8.

[169]Ibid., 9.

[170]Ibid.

[171]Ibid.

[172]Ibid., 10. "Common sense and morals oppose it, and utility itself, the source almost of what is just and right."

[173]Ibid., 18.

[174]Ibid., 19.

[175]Ibid., 20.

[176]Ibid.

[177]Ibid., 35.

[178]Ibid., 36.

[179]Wesley, Journal (Curnock), VI, 138.

[180]Wesley, A Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England, 11, 12.

[181]Ibid., 12.

[182]Ibid.

[183]Ibid., 13.

[184]Ibid., 6.

[185]Ibid., 15.

[186]Ibid., 19.

[187]Ibid., 23.

[188]Edwards, 78.

[189]Wesley, A Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England, 3.

[190]Robert Southey, The Life of John Wesley (London: Longman Press, 1864) II, 244.

[191]Ibid., 244, 245.

[192]Outler, 24n.

[193]Ibid., 25, 26.

[194]Wesley, Works, VII, 312. See also VI, 300n.

[195]Lecky, II, 630, 631.